

SESSION #5  
2017-11-13  
File: FM2-120

### Couple of quick derived vs. underived ditransitives:

**towoq** 'feed by hand' (**buboh** 'porridge')

-*towoq* is another underived ditransitive

(1) aku towoq anak=ku buboh

'I fed my baby porridge'

(2) aku towoq kanak no buboh

'I fed the child some porridge'

-no *tipaq* allowed = "super weird" ... because the action is putting food directly into the mouth, not transferring from one hand to another hand; shows the semantics of *towoq*

**piyaq** 'make'

(3) aku piyaq-an anak=ku jaje

'I made my child a cake'

-shows 'make' is a derived ditransitive

### Relativization:

#### IOCs in AV

(4a) aku gitaq **guru no** saq bèng buku tipaq murid no

'I saw **the teacher** who gave a book to the student'

-straightforward relativized A in an IOC in AV; relative clause is in AV

(4b) aku gitaq **buku** saq guru no bèng tipaq murid no

'I saw **the book** that the teacher gave to the student'

-here the T is relativized

(4c) aku gitaq **murid** saq guru no bèng buku no

I saw **the student** to whom the teacher gave the book

-here the R is relativized in a DOC

(4d) aku gitaq **murid** [saq tipaq guru no bèng buku no]  
1 see student [REL to teacher DEM give book DEM]

'I saw **the student** to whom the teacher gave the book'

-without *tipaq*, Nisa says the focus is on the student, and "you forget a little about the book"; with *tipaq*, you "see the movement of where the book is going". Again, getting at the semantics of *tipaq* here.

-What's interesting: the preposition stays inside the RC, with the gap corresponding to just the R.

### Moving into PV:

- (5a) siq=ne bèng kanak no buku no siq guru no  
 'The teacher gave a book to the student'  
 -Just a regular DOC in PV. Nothing really new here.
- (5b) siq=ne bèng buku no tipaq kanak no siq guru no  
 'The teacher gave the book to the student'  
 -The corresponding IOC in PV. Nothing new here, either.
- (6) \*aku gitaq siq=ne saq bèng tipaq murid no siq guru no  
 I saw the teacher who gave (the book) to the student  
 -This illustrates that it's not acceptable to relativize the A from within a PV relative clause--but I forgot to include buku no, so this isn't very helpful. I need a better example of the constraint against relativizing A from PV
- (7a) aku gitaq buku saq siq=ne bèng (siq guru no) tipaq murid no  
 'I saw the book that the teacher gave to the student'  
 -Here the T is relativized from a PV relative clause with IOC
- (7b) aku gitaq murid saq siq=ne bèng buku siq guru no  
 'I saw the student who the teacher gave the book'  
 -Here we have a relativized R from a PV DOC
- (7c) aku gitaq murid saq siq=ne bèng buku no tipaq murid no siq guru no  
 I saw the student who the teacher gave the book to  
 -it's OK, but it's long. Pragmatically dispreferred
- (8a) Kamu gitaq aku bèng kembang tipaq inaq=ku  
 'You saw me give a flower to my mother'  
 -just a regular matrix and embedded clause with an IOC to set the stage
- (8b) kamu gitaq aku bèng inaq=ku kembang  
 -just a regular matrix and embedded clause with a DOC to set the stage
- (9a) kamu gitaq inaq=ku [saq siq=**ku** bèng kembang]  
 'You saw my mother whom **I** gave a flower'  
 -relativized R from a PV DOC
- (9b) kamu gitaq inaq=ku [saq tipaq=**ku** bèng kembang]  
 'You saw my mother to whom **I** gave the flower'  
 -relativized R from within a PV IOC. Notice that the *tipaq* stays inside the clause, but the A is cliticized to *tipaq* because that's the first non-NP element in the clause. This is "very common" construction, cliticizing =ku on *tipaq*, Nis says
- (9c) kamu gitaq kembang saq siq=ku bèng inaq=ku

'You saw the flower that I gave my mother'  
 -relativized T from within a PV DOC in the relative clause

### What's going on with *tipaq* and clitic arguments?

- (10) Kamu tipaq=ku bèng kèpèng  
 'I give the money to you'  
 'To you I give the money' is how she translates it on 11/20  
 -Nisa says this is "very natural". She says it's OK to have a cliticized R on *tipaq*, as long as the *tipaq*-phrase is not utterance final.  
 -I wonder if there's a person hierarchy influence at play: try something like the following (x):
- (11) Pemancing no bèng kèpèng tipaq aku  
 'to me the fisherman gave the money'  
 -here aku is the R, with utterance-final *tipaq*--nothing unexpected
- (12) pemancing no tipaq=ku bèng kèpèng  
 'I give the money to the fisherman'  
 -For some reason, cliticizing the R and moving the *tipaq*-phrase to before the verb from (11) has completely flipped the meaning from an example like (10). Is this actually a PV construction, as opposed to (10)?  
 -here 'the fisherman' might just be a fronted P in PV
- (13) tipaq aku pemancing no berebèng kèpèng  
 'The fisherman gave the money to me'  
 -Fronting the *tipaq*-phrase with R, but for some reason now *ber* appears on the verb, with epenthetic schwa → not sure what's up with *ber* here